UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFOR
To: DU.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge
From: Weal On Ray Deputy Clerk Date Received: 2-1-10
Case No.: 09 CV 8927 GHK (VBKx) Case Title: Ranjit Sodhi V Grasshipper H
Document Entitled: Answer of Brentiss Answer of Grasshopper House UC An
of Mc Nairy, Answer of Pax Frentiss
Upon the submission of the attached document(s), it was noted that the following discrepancies exist:
□ Local Rule 11-3.1 Document not legible □ Local Rule 11-3.8 Lacking name, address, phone and facsimile numbers And Email Address □ Local Rule 11-4.1 No copy provided for judge □ Local Rule 19-1 Complaint/Petition includes more than ten (10) Does or fictitiously named parties □ Local Rule 15-1 Proposed amended pleading not under separate cover □ Local Rule 11-6 Memorandum/brief exceeds 25 pages □ Local Rule 11-8 Memorandum/brief exceeding 10 pages shall contain table of contents □ Local Rule 7.1-1 No Certification of Interested Parties and/or no copies □ Local Rule 6.1 Written notice of motion lacking or timeliness of notice incorrect □ Local Rule 56-1 Statement of uncontroverted facts and/or proposed judgment lacking □ Local Rule 56-2 Statement of genuine issues of material fact lacking □ Local Rule 16-6 Pretrial conference order not signed by all counsel □ FRCVP Rule 5(d) No proof of service attached to document(s) □ Other: □ Local Rule 5(d) No proof of service attached to document(s) □ Chest Is Alexandres for local rules and applicable forms.
ORDER OF THE JUDGE/MAGISTRATE JUDGE IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:
The document is to be filed and processed. The filing date is ORDERED to be the date the document was stampe "received but not filed" with the Clerk. Counsel* is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules ma lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83-7.
Date U.S. District Judge / U.S. Magistrate Judge
The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED, and is ORDERED returned to *counsel. *Counsel sha immediately notify, in writing, all parties previously served with the attached documents that said documents have no been filed with the Court.
2/2/10
Date U.S. District Judge / U .S. Magistra te Judge
*The term "counsel" as used herein also includes any pro se party. See Local Rule 1-3.

75, 79, 81, 82, 83, 104, 113, 117, 129, 130, 133, 137, and 140 of the Complaint defendant is

ANSWER

28

Cas	e 2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8 Filed 02/02/2010 Page 3 of 13			
1	without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations			
2	contained in said paragraphs, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained			
3	therein.			
4	4) Defendant answers the incorporated paragraphs 45, 59, 67, 73, 94, 102, 109, 119, 127,			
5	and 135 in the same way that defendant answered the incorporated paragraphs previously.			
6				
7	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
8	5) This action is subject to a previously filed class action in State Court for the same			
9	alleged class.			
10				
11	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
12	6) Plaintiff is not qualified to represent the alleged class.			
13				
14	Dated: January 28, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI			
15	By			
16	THOMAS A. NITTI Attorneys for Defendant			
17	JEFF MCNAIRY			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	2			
	ANSWER			

Cas	e 2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8 Filed 02/02/2010 Page 4 of 13					
1	PROOF OF SERVICE					
2	State of California, County of Los Angeles					
3	1 1: the County of Log Angeles State of California Lam over the age of 18					
4	and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205, Santa Monica, California 90401.					
5	On January 28 2010, I served the following document(s) described as:					
6	ANSWER					
7	on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed					
8	envelope(s), addressed as follows (sans any fax number):					
9	Law Offices of Michael Tracy					
10	2030 Main Street, Suite 1300 Irvine, CA 92614					
11	Fax: (866) 365-3051					
12						
13	BY PERSONAL SERVICE – I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the					
14	addressee.					
15	BY FAX – I faxed the document to the fax number indicated below the addressee's name and address (without envelope).					
16	BY MAIL - I deposited such envelope in the mail at Santa Monica, California. The					
17	envelope was mailed with the postage thereon fully prepaid.					
18	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the above is true and					
19	correct.					
20	Ny 1					
21	Date: January 28, 2010 Nydia Escalona					
22						
23						
24						
25						
26	δ					
27	7					
28	3					
	ANSWER					

PROOF OF SERVICE

LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI
Thomas A. Nitti, SBN 77590
1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205
Santa Monica, CA 90401
Tel.: (310) 393-1524
Fax: (310) 576-3581
Twitte Modiay. NET
Attorney for Defendant
GRASSHOPPER HOUSE LLC



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RANJIT SODHI, an individual, on behalf of herself and other similarly situated and on behalf of The State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency as a Private Attorney General,

Plaintiff,

۱v.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27


28

GRASSHOPPER HOUSE LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; CHRIS PRENTISS, an individual; PAX PRENTISS, an individual; JEFF MCNAIRY, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,

Defendants.

CASE NO. CV09 08927 GHK VBKx

ANSWER



.....

1) Defendant, GRASSHOPPER HOUSE LLC ("DEFENDANT"), denies the allegations contained in Paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 40, 44, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 80, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126,, 131, 132, 134, 138, 139, and 141 of the complaint.

- 2) Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3, 4, 9, 33, 46, 60, 68, 74, 85, 95, 103, 110, 120, 128, and 136 of the complaint.
- 3) Answering Paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 48, 49, 62, 75, 79, 81, 82, 83, 104, 113, 117, 129, 130, 133, 137, and 140 of the Complaint defendant is

Case	2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8	Filed 02/02/2010 Page 8 of 13		
1 2 3 4 5 6	LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI Thomas A. Nitti, SBN 77590 1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205 Santa Monica, CA 90401 Tel.: (310) 393-1524 Fax: (310) 576-3581 Thire Prod: 37. Det Attorney for Defendant CHRIS PRENTISS	20 Mayo		
7	UNITED STATE	CS DISTRICT COURT		
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10	RANJIT SODHI, an individual, on behalf of herself and other similarly situated and on behalf of The State of California Labor and	CASE NO. CV09 08927 GHK VBKx		
11	Workforce Development Agency as a Private Attorney General,	ANSWER		
12	Plaintiff,			
13	v.	RECEIVED BUT NOT FILED		
14 15	GRASSHOPPER HOUSE LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; CHRIS			
16	PRENTISS, an individual; PAX PRENTISS, an individual; JEFF MCNAIRY, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive.	FEB - 1 2010		
17	Defendants.	CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION BY DEPUTY		
18				
19 20	1) Defendant, CHRIS PRENTISS ("D	EFENDANT"), denies the allegations contained in		
21	Paragraphs 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 1	6, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 40,		
22	44, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 80, 84, 86,			
23	87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116,			
24	118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126,, 131, 132,	134, 138, 139, and 141 of the complaint.		
25	2) Defendant admits the allegations co	ontained in Paragraphs 3, 9, 33, 46, 60, 68, 74, 85,		
26	95, 103, 110, 120, 128, and 136 of the compla	nint.		
27	3) Answering Paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 18, 1	19, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 48, 49, 62,		
28	75, 79, 81, 82, 83, 104, 113, 117, 129, 130, 13	33, 137, and 140 of the Complaint defendant is		
	A	NSWER		

Case	2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8 Filed 02/02/2010 Page 9 01 13			
1	without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations			
2	contained in said paragraphs, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained			
3	therein.			
4	4) Defendant answers the incorporated paragraphs 45, 59, 67, 73, 94, 102, 109, 119, 127,			
5	and 135 in the same way that defendant answered the incorporated paragraphs previously.			
6				
7	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
8	5) This action is subject to a previously filed class action in State Court for the same			
9	alleged class.			
10				
11	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE			
12	6) Plaintiff is not qualified to represent the alleged class.			
13				
14	Dated: January 28, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI			
15	By			
16	THOMAS A. NITTI Attorneys for Defendant			
17	CHRIS PRENTISS			
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28	2			
	arLambda			

ANSWER

ı e	Case	2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8 Filed 02/02/2010 Page 11 of 13		
74	2 3 4 5	LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI Thomas A. Nitti, SBN 77590 1250 Sixth Street, Suite 205 Santa Monica, CA 90401 Tel.: (310) 393-1524 Fax: (310) 576-3581 TWITTI PRODICY, NET. Attorney for Defendant PAX PRENTISS		
ORIGINAL	7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
B	8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
0	9 10 11	RANJIT SODHI, an individual, on behalf of herself and other similarly situated and on behalf of The State of California Labor and Workforce Development Agency as a Private Attorney General, CASE NO. CV09 08927 GHK VBKx ANSWER		
	12	Plaintiff,		
	13	v. RECEIVED		
	14 15	GRASSHOPPER HOUSE LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; CHRIS BUT NOT FILED		
	16	PRENTISS, an individual; PAX PRENTISS, an individual; JEFF MCNAIRY, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,		
	17 18	Defendants. CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA WESTERN DIVISION BY CERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA DEPUTY		
	19			
	20	1) Defendant, PAX PRENTISS ("DEFENDANT"), denies the allegations contained in		
	21	Paragraphs 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 40,		
	22	44, 47, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66 69, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 78, 80, 84, 86,		
	23	87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 105, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116,		
	24	118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126,, 131, 132, 134, 138, 139, and 141 of the complaint.		
	25	2) Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraphs 3, 9, 33, 46, 60, 68, 74, 85,		
	26	95, 103, 110, 120, 128, and 136 of the complaint. 3) Answering Paragraphs 1, 2, 5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 31, 32, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 48, 49, 62,		
	27 28	75, 79, 81, 82, 83, 104, 113, 117, 129, 130, 133, 137, and 140 of the Complaint defendant is		
	20			

ANSWER

Case	2:09-cv-08927-GHK-VBK Document 8 Filed 02/02/2010 Page 12 of 13					
1	without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations					
2	contained in said paragraphs, and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained					
3	therein.					
4	4) Defendant answers the incorporated paragraphs 45, 59, 67, 73, 94, 102, 109, 119, 127,					
5	and 135 in the same way that defendant answered the incorporated paragraphs previously.					
6						
7	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
8	5) This action is subject to a previously filed class action in State Court for the same					
9	alleged class.					
10						
11	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE					
12	6) Plaintiff is not qualified to represent the alleged class.					
13						
14	Dated: January 28, 2010 LAW OFFICES OF THOMAS A. NITTI					
15	BV					
16 17	THOMAS A. NITTI Attorneys for Defendant					
18	PAX PŘENTISS					
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						
26						
27						
28						
	ANSWER					
I	THIS II DIE					